

information and the examination geometry and provides these to a material sensitive probe that can be a directional or a non-directional probe. The material sensitive probe employs the geometry and acquires material specific information about the suspicious region. A computer processes the acquired material specific information to identify presence of the specific material in the suspicious region.

In the Office Action of July 23, 1996, claims 1-3, 11-13, 15-17, and 27-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Peschmann et al., and claims 4-10, 14, 18-26, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Peschmann. Applicants respectfully disagree with these rejections for the following reasons:

The invention claimed in independent claims 1, 13, 15, and 29 is not disclosed by Peschmann alone or in combination with the known prior art. When closely examined, Peschmann teaches a CT scanner for detection of concealed objects. Peschmann also teaches the use of an X-ray prescanner in combination with the CT scanner. The prescanner may be a separate X-ray line scanner or the CT scanner used with it's rotating module in a stationary arrangement (see col. 9 lines 3-15 of the 5,182,764 patent) Peschmann summarizes the teaching as follows:

The apparatus uses CT scanning to identify concealed objects ... To reduce the amount of CT scanning required, a number of prescanning approaches are disclosed. Based upon the prescan data, selected locations for CT scanning are identified. CT scanning is then undertaken only at the selected locations. The resultant CT scan data is subjected to CT reconstruction, the reconstruction is utilized to automatically identify objects of interest. This identification of objects may be verified through further automatic analysis of such attributes as shape, texture, and context. Finally, the objects of interest may be reconstructed and displayed for example on a three dimensional reconstruction computer for visual analysis by an operator. (Col. 2, lines 36-51)

The prescanner of Peschmann is not the claimed multi-view X-ray inspection probe of the present invention. Furthermore,

Peschmann does not disclose the use of the material sensitive probe after a multi-view X-ray inspection probe has found a suspicious region and determined a geometry for the subsequent examination.

Nowhere does Peschmann disclose the claimed invention. While an "improved" version of the Peschmann CT scanner may be compared to the multi-view inspection probe of the present invention, Peschmann does not disclose, or even hint, that his CT scanner should be used only to identify a suspicious region or provide a geometry for the subsequent examination using a second material sensitive probe. The CT scanner of Peschmann is used as a "second stage" device after his prescanner identified the selected locations for CT scanning. The CT scanner then examines the selected locations, identifies objects of interest based on the CT reconstruction or automatic analysis of such attributes as shape, texture, and context. It is important to appreciate that the CT scanner of Peschmann does not identify a geometry for the subsequent examination by, for example, the coherent X-ray scatter probe shown in Fig. 5 of the present specification.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Official Notice made by the Examiner as applied to the present case. While individually, the forward scatter, back scatter, dual energy scan, and various material sensitive probes may be known in the package inspection art (and several of them were described in U.S. patents to the first-named inventor of this application), none of these were described or employed as claimed in the present invention. Also, Applicants recognize that their invention utilizes the basic principles disclosed in the prior art, but no prior art of record teaches specifically or implicitly the claimed invention.

In column 10, lines 49-61 cited by the Examiner, Peschmann et al., if anything, teach away from the present invention. In column 10, lines 49-61, Peschmann discloses a prescreening step prior to his prescan step and his subsequent CT scanning. The prescreening may be accomplished by TNA measurements, vapor sniffing, acoustical vibration analysis, and

mechanical vibration analysis. This disclosure would not motivate one skilled in the art to turn the disclosure around and employ a material sensitive probe after the multi-view X-ray inspection probe has identified a suspicious region in the baggage. Furthermore, this disclosure nowhere teaches that the multi-view X-ray inspection probe should also determine the geometry of the subsequent examination that uses the second, material sensitive probe of the present invention. Therefore, no prior art of record discloses or even suggests the invention claimed in independent claims 1, 13, 15, and 29.


In summary, the above-described differences are more than enough to patentably distinguish all pending claims from Peschmann et al. alone or in combination with prior art of record. Accordingly, all claims are now submitted in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Enclosed is an executed Revocation and New Power of Attorney. Please charge any additional fees, including fees for the new claims, or make any credits, to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Should there be any unresolved issue left, the Examiner is respectfully invited to call the undersigned representative so that such issue can be promptly resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Oct. 23, 1996


Ivan D. Zitkovsky
Reg. No. 37,482

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804

Telephone: 617/542-5070
Facsimile: 617/542-8906

204316.B11